



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,932	04/15/2004	Ludovic Ruat	01RO12854443	7552
27975	7590	07/28/2008	EXAMINER	
ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A. 1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE P.O. BOX 3791 ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791			DSOUZA, JOSEPH FRANCIS A	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		2611
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		07/28/2008 ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

creganoa@addmg.com

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/2/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a) Argument: Applicant argued that in his invention: "since the first state machine is configured to detect the break character within the header, it ensures a complete detection of the frame header before activating the second state machine for detecting the standard characters (when in the second operating mode)" (Remarks 7/2/2008, page 11, last full paragraph) whereas in Hong "there is the potential that the break character detection unit 198 begins operation before the standard character processing unit 202 detects a frame header" (Remarks 7/2/2008, page 12, 1<sup>st</sup> 4 lines).

Response: In Applicant's method, the second state machine is activated after the break characters are detected (see Specification [0033], last 4 lines). In Hong's Fig. 22, the break characters are clearly detected first in block 198 before the block 202 starts. Therefore, Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument.

b) Argument: Applicant argued that having separate state machines allows different operating modes to be supported (Remarks 7/2/2008, page 12, middle paragraph)

Response: This would be true in Hong's system as well. If the state machines were separated then the same advantage would be available.

c) Argument: Applicant argued that Examiner is using a three-way rejection and that Gulick discloses an asynchronous frame receiver (Remarks 7/2/2008, page 12, last 5 lines) but Sexton fails to disclose that the controllers are operating as asynchronous frame receivers (Remarks 7/2/2008, page 13, 2<sup>nd</sup> last paragraph)

Response: Examiner respectfully disagrees. Firstly, Sexton is being used to disclose the header comprising a break character with a data bit length greater than a data bit length of the standard characters (CTFR 5/2/2008, page 4, last 2 paragraphs). One of ordinary skill in the art can easily use such a feature in either a synchronous or an asynchronous system. Secondly, though Sexton does not explicitly use the words "synchronous" or "asynchronous", it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the mode described in Sexton (column 2, lines 3 - 31), that the mode is asynchronous since the slave PLCs have to monitor for a break character and because the length of the message is transmitted, implying variable length messages.

ooo